

## REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 7, 2004 in which Claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20-29 were rejected. With this response, Claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31 and 33 are amended. Claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20-29 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On October 18, 2004, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Wallerson and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. Claims 1, 3, 10, 23, 25, 26, 33, 35, 38 and 39 were discussed with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based upon Mayer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,746,528. It was agreed upon that such claims, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Mayer.

With respect to Claim 1, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a holder having an opening configured to permit media in the receptacle to pass through the opening into contact with a media edge registration surface of a media tray.

With respect to Claim 10, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a holder having a manually operable clamp.

With respect to Claim 21, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a clamp that is movable between a clamped position and an unclamped position, wherein the clamp is resiliently biased towards the unclamped position.

With respect to Claim 23, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a manually actuable button operably coupled to the clamp and configured to actuate the clamp to the clamped position.

With respect to Claim 24, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a printer having a body with a holder registration surface and a registration ridge coupled to the holder so as to slide along the holder registration surface.

With respect to Claim 25, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a pair of holder registration surfaces which form a channel to receive the registration ridge.

With respect to Claim 26, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose such a channel having a lead-in guide.

With respect to Claim 33, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a media handling system having a holder with a wall that is movable towards a media edge registration surface of a tray so as to move media into contact with the edge registration surface.

With respect to Claim 35, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose such a wall that is resiliently biased towards the media edge registration surface.

With respect to Claim 38, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a holder that has a clamp resiliently biased towards one of a clamped position and an unclamped position.

With respect to Claim 39, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a holder having a lateral opening configured to print media held by the holder and laterally project beyond the holder into engagement with the media edge registration surface.

In addition, the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 was discussed. It was clarified that the recited first formation reads upon notch 70 while the second formation reads upon cross member 32. It was further pointed out that the first formation and the second formation may comprise other structures. For example, the first formation may alternatively comprise a cross member, while the second formation comprises a notch. It was agreed upon that the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 would be withdrawn.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Wallerson for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for Examiner Wallerson's suggestions for amending the claims to overcome the prior art rejection.

II. Rejection of Claims 27-30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on October 18, 2004, it was agreed upon that the rejection of Claims 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, would be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-13, 15-26 and 31-39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Based Upon Mayer.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-13, 15-26 and 31-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mayer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,746,528. With this response, Claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 22, 24, 25, 31 and 33 are amended. Claims 1-13, 15-26 and 31-39, as amended, overcome the rejection and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

A. Claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a printer which includes a holder having a lateral opening facing a media edge registration surface, wherein the opening is configured to permit media in the receptacle to pass through the opening into contact with the registration surface. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on October 18, 2004, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose such a holder. Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Mayer. Claims 2-10, Claims 21-26 and Claims 31-32 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 3.

Claim 3, as amended, depends from Claim 1 and recites that the media tray, when fully inserted into the printer for printing operations, has a first portion contained in a printer body and a second portion extending from the printer body. Claim 3 further recites that when the media tray is fully inserted into the printer for printing operations, the media receptacle is largely received in the first portion while the holder has a handle extending from the receptacle and occupies the second portion of the tray. Support for Claim 3 is found in Figures 2 and 3 which illustrate tray 74 fully inserted into the printer for printing operations, wherein tray 74 has a portion that extends from the printer body and wherein the holder has a handle occupying the portion of the tray that extends from the printer body. Applicants respectfully note that the phrase “fully inserted into the printer for printing operations” means that the tray is fully inserted to enable printing operations, not necessarily being fully enclosed or surrounded by the printer.

Mayer fails to disclose the printer recited in Claim 3. In particular, Mayer fails to disclose a media tray which, when fully inserted into the printer for printing operations, has a first portion contained in the printer body and a second portion extending from the printer body. In contrast, Mayer discloses tray 123 that, when fully inserted for printer operations, is completely enclosed within the printer. The printer of Mayer does not include a tray that has a portion that extends from the printer body and a handle that occupies the portion that extends from the printer body. Accordingly, Claim 3, as amended, overcomes the rejection for this additional reason.

C. Claim 11.

Claim 11, as amended, recites a media holder for a printer having a media tray with a media edge registration surface. The holder has a lateral opening facing the registration surface and configured to permit media in the holder to pass through the opening into contact with the media edge registration surface.

Mayer fails to disclose a holder having a lateral opening configured to permit media to pass through the opening into contact with an edge registration surface of a media tray in which the holder is received. As noted above with respect to Claim 1, it was agreed upon that Mayer failed to disclose such a holder. Accordingly, Claim 11, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Mayer. Claims 12-13 and 15-17 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

D. Claim 18.

Claim 18 recites a method of printing. The method includes positioning a media holder in a tray, wherein media within the media holder is abutted against the registration surface of the tray.

Mayer fails to disclose such a method of printing. In contrast, media positioned within tray 201 does not abut any registration surface of tray 123. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 18 based upon Mayer be withdrawn. Claim 20 depends from Claim 18 and overcomes the rejection for the same reasons.

E. Claims 21 and 23.

Claim 21 depends from Claim 1 and recites that the printer further includes a clamp movable between a clamped position and a unclamped position, wherein the clamp is resiliently biased towards the unclamped position. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on October 18, 2004, it was agreed upon that the rejection of Claim 21 based upon Mayer is improper and would be withdrawn. Similarly, with respect to Claim 23, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a manually actuatable button configured to actuate the clamp to the clamped position. Accordingly, it was agreed upon that the rejection of Claim 23 based upon Mayer was also improper and would be withdrawn.

F. Claims 24-26.

Claim 24 depends from Claim 1 and further recites that the printer includes a body configured to receive the tray, wherein the body has a first holder registration surface extending parallel to the media edge registration surface. Claim 24 also recites that a registration ridge is coupled to the holder and is configured to slide along the holder registration surface. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on October 18, 2004, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose such a holder registration surface or a registration ridge. Accordingly, Claim 24, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Mayer.

Claim 25 depends from Claim 24 and further recites a second holder registration surface which cooperates with the first holder registration surface to form a channel to receive the registration ridge. Claim 26 depends from Claim 25 and further recites a lead-in guide adjacent the channel. During the Examiner interview held on October 18, 2004, it was further agreed upon that Mayer also fails to disclose the channel or the lead-in guide of Claims 25 and 26. Accordingly, Claims 25 and 26, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Mayer for these additional reasons.

G. Claim 31.

Claim 31 depends from Claim 1 and recites that the printer forms an aperture into which the tray is inserted. Claim 31 also recites that the holder is configured to be moved from a fully inserted to a completely removed position from the tray while the tray is fully inserted into the aperture for printing operations.

Mayer fails to disclose a holder that may be moved from a fully inserted to a completely removed position all while the tray is fully inserted into an aperture of a printer for printing operations. In contrast, when tray 123 of Mayer is fully inserted for printing operations, tray 201 cannot be accessed and cannot be moved from a fully inserted to a completely removed position. Thus, Claim 31, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Mayer for this additional reason.

H. Claim 33.

Claim 33, as amended, recites a media handling system which includes a tray having a media edge registration surface and a wall facing the media edge registration surface and movable towards the edge registration surface so as to move media into contact with the edge registration surface. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on October 18, 2004, it was agreed upon that Mayer fails to disclose a holder having such a wall. Accordingly, Claim 33, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Mayer. Claims 34-39 depend from Claim 33 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20-29 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Nov. 12, 2004

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
777 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-5306  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276